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Introduction and background

The important role that local communities play in combating illegal wildlife trade (IWT) is increasingly being recognized as a key component in effective anti-poaching strategies and has been enshrined in a number of recent global policy statements and commitments. However, to date there has been little guidance available on how to effectively engage communities in practice.

This is a gap that the project “Strengthening local community engagement in combating illegal wildlife trade” aims to help address. This project is funded by the UK Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Illegal Wildlife Trade Challenge Fund and aims to better understand the conditions for stronger engagement of local communities to combat - rather than participate in – IWT in African elephants and other species, while positively contributing to local livelihoods. The project is working with local communities, conservation organizations and other stakeholders to identify key success factors and constraints in effective community engagement in fighting IWT. As a guiding framework, the project implementers are using a dynamic Theory of Change (ToC) developed by SuLi and partners to help understand how to best strengthen the engagement of local communities in combating IWT. This ToC outlines four main pathways that are necessary to engage local communities effectively: (A) Strengthening disincentives (social and legal) for illegal behavior (B) Increasing incentives for stewardship (C) Decreasing costs of living with wildlife and (D) Supporting non-wildlife related livelihoods. The lessons learned from the project will be used to generate and disseminate case studies and guidance for conservation organizations, policy-makers and donors on strengthening community engagement in combating IWT in Kenya and beyond.

To implement this project the IUCN ESARO Conservation Areas & Species programme, the IUCN SSC CEESP Sustainable Livelihoods Specialist Group (SuLi), the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG) and the Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) have partnered with the Big Life Foundation (BLF), the Cottar Safari Service (CSS) and the Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association (KWCA) to assess existing community engagements in the Amboseli Ecosystem and the Olderekesi Conservancy adjacent to the Maasai Mara National Reserve. The project is also sharing lessons and methodologies with the Southern Rangelands Association of Land Owners (SORALO), which works with Maasai communities in a large swathe of southern Kenya with a mission to help develop and enhance a network of conservancies and to strengthen its community-based approaches to reducing IWT.

From the 23rd to the 27th of May 2016 the project partners held an inception workshop at the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office in Nairobi Kenya. The workshop was designed to help understand the local context at the pilot sites and to develop a methodological framework and work plan to guide the next stages in the project. The participants benefited greatly from guidance provided by Professor Wendy Rowe of Royal Roads University in Victoria, Canada on how to engage communities in collaborative learning and practice using action research principles and processes. Good progress was made in the development and testing of a prototype situation assessment tool, structured along the main pathways of the ToC, which proved extremely useful in helping the participants to quickly gain insights into the main challenges and opportunities at site level through a highly interactive and participatory approach. The workshop was also extremely useful in helping to validate and refine the over-arching ToC, particularly in the context of a mixed livestock-wildlife economy, which is a common feature of the Kenyan pilot sites participating in the project. The next steps in the project, following the roadmap developed at the workshop includes collection of more detailed baseline information and honing of the tools and methodologies ahead of the field work scheduled to begin in the second half of August 2016.
Workshop proceedings

The first day of the workshop was designed to set the context and to introduce the rationale and methodology for the project. The rest of the week was spent on more detailed situation analyses and developing the methodological framework for the project. The workshop was primarily attended by representatives from the project partner agencies. A few other external parties with an interest in the project attended the first day of the workshop. The participant list is provided in Annex I to this report. The workshop agenda was flexible and was frequently adjusted throughout course of the week reflecting the flexible and participatory nature of the sessions – see Annex II for the outline agenda.

Introductions and setting the context

Introductions and meeting agenda

The workshop started with a welcoming address from Leo Niskanen, IUCN ESARO Technical Coordinator Conservation Areas & Species Programme. After a round of self-introductions Leo introduced the workshop objectives and agenda. This was followed by a series of introductory presentations, briefly summarized below. The full presentations have been shared via dropbox with the project partners.

Local Communities: The first line of defense in combating illegal wildlife trade – Dr Holly Dublin (SuLi, AfESG, IUCN ESARO)

In her presentation Holly Dublin provided a quick overview of the IWT and responses to it emphasizing the inadequate attention given to engagement with local communities. The important role that local communities is increasingly being recognized and is encapsulated in global policy statements and commitments, but there is little guidance on how to go about this in practice. In response SuLi and partners have developed a dynamic Theory of Change (ToC) on how to successfully engage communities in the fight against IWT. The ToC consists of four main pathways: (A) Strengthening disincentives (social and legal) for illegal behavior (B) Increasing incentives for stewardship (C) Decreasing costs of living with wildlife and (D) Supporting non-wildlife related livelihoods. This TOC is now undergoing practical application to gather experience, testing and refining with ongoing and new interventions. The DEFRA IWTCF-project initiated at this workshop is the first pilot initiative to apply the ToC to real life situations on the ground. Several lessons have already been learned from the analysis of case studies from around the world and various consultations resulting in “rules of engagement” – key principles and best practices for effective engagement with communities in combating IWT.

Some of the issues raised in the question & answer session after the presentation were as follows:

- Rules of engagement for dealing with communities are important but implementation is the challenge. How do we apply these rules when communities are all different requiring different entry points? Successful community engagement takes time. How do we balance this with the immediate needs of dealing with a poaching crisis? The development community has not learned to respond to this effectively. How do we demonstrate some “quick wins” with communities?
- There is a lot of reliance on tourism as the main benefit stream from wildlife to communities, but revenues are limited and it is not easy to demonstrate impact at household level. Few examples of other types of benefits seem to exist, and the links between development alternative non-wildlife based livelihoods and how these impact on the wildlife resource seem unclear.
• There needs to be capacity building at the local level to engage in these issues.
• When you look at the new Wildlife Act it is difficult to see what the incentives are that the government is providing for continued wildlife and livestock co-existence.
• There are contradictory priorities at play e.g. agriculture is encroaching on Amboseli and is being promoted as land use – there is high level of human-elephant conflict even while poaching levels are not that high, there is major land sub-division and speculation. Nomadism is a thing of the past. Costs of living with wildlife are outweighing benefits. These are the challenges we need to respond to.

Illegal wildlife trafficking community engagement - Applying An Action Research Framework – Professor Wendy Rowe - Royal Roads University, Victoria, B.C. Canada

Professor Rowe introduced the workshop participants to the key features of action research and its implementation in the context of strengthening engagement of communities in combating IWT. The iterative, “learning-by-doing” nature of the process was explained. This helped the participants to orient their thinking for the rest of the workshop and to help in the subsequent design of the research methodology and the next steps in the field work at the pilot sites.

Strengthening Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade
Project Objectives and Activities –Leo Niskanen

Mr. Niskanen gave a brief overview of the IWTCF project objectives and expected outputs and outcomes:

GOAL: More effective and widespread community engagement in tackling IWT resulting in reduction in pressure on African elephant populations and increased benefits from improved wildlife stewardship

Expected Outcome: The conditions for stronger engagement of local communities to combat - rather than participate in - IWT while positively contributing to local livelihoods is better understood and forms the basis of practical guidance for anti-IWT policy and programme development in Kenya (and beyond).

Output 1: Two case studies of existing community engagement projects analyzed against theory of change
Output 2: Revised Theory of Change - based on case studies conducted and comparable lessons from other conservancy initiatives

Output 3: Guidance developed for designing and strengthening community engagement projects in the context of IWT

Leo also introduced the roles of the implementing partners, and explained the overall timeframe for activities and the approximate budget allocation.

**Presentation of baseline data**
Detailed presentations were given by Cottar Safari Service, Big Life foundation and SORALO describing the baseline situation at their respective sites. This was followed by a presentation from KWCA on the relevant legislative and regulatory framework in Kenya. The full presentations have been circulated to participants via dropbox. Only brief summaries of the contents of the presentations and the main issues raised in subsequent discussions are provided here.

**OLDERKESI WILDLIFE COMMUNITY CONSERVANCY - James Kaigil – Cottar Safari Service**

The Olderkesi wildlife Conservancy is an important conservation area bordering the Maasai Mara National Reserve, acting as a buffer zone for this protected area. See map in the presentation.

The conservancy falls within the greater Serengeti-Mara ecosystem which is rich in biodiversity and has a wide variety of habitats. Olderkesi conservancy provides vital wildlife dispersal areas for wildlife from the National Reserve. The greater Olderkesi Group ranch connects the MMNR with Loita Hills, another biodiversity-rich ecosystem. This makes it imperative to develop effective management strategies that will ensure the conservation of these vital services provided by the conservancy i.e. buffer zone, wildlife disposal area and connecting ecosystems/habitats.

The Olderkesi wildlife Conservancy, unlike all other Mara conservancies, is a community conservancy bringing together the 4,200 Maasai landowners of Olderkesi under a single land title deed covering an initial area of 7,600 acres, in which every member has an equal shareholding. There are no individual private plots and shares cannot be sold to outsiders, only transferred between members. This unique arrangement in the Mara has been the culmination of 13 years of work between the Cottar family and the local Maasai community. Rather than the Maasai earning money through leasing their land to tourism partners, they have signed a 10-year ‘payment for environmental services’ agreement that aims to outcompete the financial returns possible from agriculture and livestock, manage the conservancy and protect wildlife and habitat.
In order to ensure transparency and accountability, the CWT deposits lease fees to a bank account, if that is not possible OCWT will sign and declare that they have received the agreed upon lease fees (minus 5% that goes into management). CWCT keeps clear records of the sums paid to OCWT in their records. In addition, there should be only one flow of benefits i.e. CWCT to OWCT to community projects / revenues, OR revenue sharing by M-pesa when that is decided on by the committee (i.e conservancy expanding in area).

Conservation targets:

- Grazing areas
- Wildebeest habitat
- Sand river and springs
- Wildlife corridors
- Elephants
- Carnivores

Main threats:

- Overgrazing and Resource overexploitation.
- Habitat fragmentation and land degradation
- Human Wildlife Conflict
- Land use change and land subdivision
- Poaching (two rhinos lost recently)
- Climate change

Those involved in charcoal and sand extraction come from outside the community and also often engage in wildlife poaching.

Old Maasai traditions and taboos against killing wildlife are being eroded.
The key conservation and management strategies to be implemented are: (1.) Protective and effective management of the landscape and habitat mosaic of the conservation area. (2.) Develop a targeted ecological monitoring and management programme.

The community, livelihoods and resource use of management strategies include: (1.) Development of natural resource use limits i.e. restrictions. (2) Development of human- wildlife Mitigation and Prevention Measures. (3) Development and improvement of benefit sharing agreements and practices for enhanced flow of benefits to the community.

Guidelines for natural resource use limits and restrictions have already been developed and agreed to by the community; however, not all members of the community around Olderkesi conservancy are aware of all the rules or have full understanding. Efforts are under way to raise awareness and understanding at community level.

The future of Olderkesi’s wildlife needs to be secured by protecting key wildlife corridors linking Olderkesi to surrounding wildlife refuges and buffer zones e.g. with Loita plains onwards to Loita Hills – no yet formally protected. See map in presentation. Importantly, the Olderkesi region is the key to securing critical elephant migration corridors from the Reserve to an area east of Olderkesi called Nguruman. Up to 4,000 elephants a year migrate across this area and are increasingly encountering farming and the fencing of land blocking their traditional routes. With the type of support Olderkesi has the potential to expand to 66,000 acres in the next 5 years, thereby securing both the elephants as well as the livelihoods of approx. 33,000 individuals. A land use plan is under development for the Group Ranch.

Community rangers help carry out monitoring of vegetation and wildlife. A common problem in the management of conservancies is that many are managed without the benefits of any scientifically based principles, as no data in wildlife and habitat is collected, and where it is collected it is not rigorously and systematically analyzed. The community rangers in Olderkesi will be trained in observations, measurements, filling of data sheets and use of monitoring equipment such as GPS and maps. Trained, literate rangers are paired with non-trained and sometimes illiterate rangers so they can work in pairs. The rangers are expected to work with the conservancy managers in order to carry out monitoring.

Issues arising from subsequent discussions:

- Other Mara conservancies are individually owned, Olderkesi is different – how do avoid local politics and put in place mechanisms to ensure there isn’t a fight over control of the conservancy?
- This is mitigated by the conservancy / land committee which comes together to make decisions through a representational democracy. Chiefs and MCAs are ex-officio members of the committee. Indirect benefits are agreed by the Committee. Direct benefits go to all the members equally. The community projects that are developed are selected randomly
- The conservancy land use planning needs to link with county land use planning processes.
- All conservancy plans have to be submitted to county. There is also a necessity to have public meeting (baraza) before the plans are agreed. In some other areas, there are challenges because there are people who are not benefitting from wildlife.
- The key wildlife regulation mechanism is the County Wildlife Conservation and Compensation Committee (CWCCC). The Chairman is chosen through a competitive process, and there 4 are community members in the CWCCC. The jury is still out on how well these will function
• No systematic collection of data on wildlife populations is in place (yet)
• KWS and Kenya Police assist with arresting of poachers. There are some real challenges dealing with poaching from across the border in some areas. Kenya and Tanzania share access to (livestock) markets across the border and these can act as entry points for IWT. There is informal collaboration between authorities in Tanzania and between some tourism operators e.g. with Klein’s camp in the Serengeti. The linkages between Maasai communities across both borders are strong and operate through “gentleman’s agreements”.
• There is a hunting operation across the border, linked to Friedkin Conservation Trust; they spend quite a both of funding in the communities. It would be important to share more lessons across the border

**Strengthening Community Engagement in Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) – Anthony Kasanga – Big Life Foundation**

BLF cover a large area on the Kenya-Tanzania border comprised of several protected areas. See map. Detailed information was presented on population demographics, education levels and main economic activities – see presentation. Some key points are summarized below.

*Community structures*

**Formal structures**

- Local administration-Chiefs, county administrators
- Group ranch committees-Chairman, treasurer, secretary and members
- Community based organizations- BLF, MWCT, Noomayianta CBO, AET, Lion Guardians. E.g., BLF works closely with the group ranch chairmen on the ranches where it operates. This comprises of the council of elders.

**Informal structures**

- Big Life Advisory committee
- Education committee
- Traditional warrior chiefs.(Menye Layiok)
- Cultural bomas- Osiram, Sian

**Key stakeholders:**
- Community leadership (Group ranch Committees) manage resources on behalf of the community.
- Kenya Wildlife Service - Protect and conserve wildlife.
- Tour Operators – Ecotourism business
- Community based conservation organization – partnering with communities to protect wildlife for community benefit.
- Kenya Police Service – Law enforcement.

*Existing wildlife-based land use*

**Conservancies:**

- Eco-tourism businesses within communities land and protected areas.
- Wildlife conservation is practised alongside livestock keeping
- Existing protected areas and national parks. E.g. Chyulu NP, Ambosel NP and Tsavo NP.
Benefit Sharing arrangements:
- Part of conservation fees is used to support conservation activities.
- The rest is allocated for community development activities, such as water, education.
- Employment of local people in tourism businesses and community based conservation organization.

Wildlife resources:
- Elephant, buffalo, lion, cheetah, leopard, giraffe, wildebeest, impala, hyena, jackal, eland, warthog, hippo
- Population census data available and were presented for several species – see slides

Main threats:
- Poaching both commercial and subsistence (mostly subsistence)
- Human-wildlife conflict
- Habitat destruction
- Road accidents (esp. Emali-Ltk road)

Monitoring systems include:
- Tailor-made applications for wildlife monitoring e.g. SMART, Cybertracker and WILD at BLF.
  Data is shared with key partners
- Wildlife crimes monitoring
- Informer network.

Main species targeted in IWT:
- Elephants and rhino for ivory and horns respectively
- Big cats for their skins and other trophies e.g. claws.
- Herbivores for both commercial and subsistence poaching

Operational aspects
- Informer networks within and outside the communities. Paid- achievement based incentives
- Young men employed as community rangers
- Establishing ranger outposts within community land and in the bordering national parks.
- Community rangers patrol and conduct joint operations with KWS in the ecosystem

Human-wildlife conflict

Monitoring system:
- Tailor-made applications for conflict monitoring like SMART, cyber tracker and Wild. Data is shared with key partners.
- Ranger night patrol on hotspots conflict zone e.g. the upper slopes of Kilimanjaro
- Informer network

Main species involved:
- Elephants, zebra, eland.
- Lions, hyenas, cheetah and jackals

Type of conflict:
• Crop raiding, livestock depredation, property damage e.g. fences, granaries, water tanks.
• Water conflict with farmers who use water upstream.

Degree of Severity:
• Conflict is high from both crop raiding elephants and depredation incidents at different times of the year.
• Crop raids occur during the harvesting season between January to June. See Annual Report 2015. While depredation occurs during the dry season July to November.

Current efforts to address conflict:
• Having patrol teams in hotspots areas, e.g. Kimana, upper slopes, Namelok and Isinet
• Using deterrent mechanisms like thunder flashes, pepper balls
• Community education on how to handle conflict.
• Big Life compensation programme for livestock killed by predators.
• Moran Education Initiative.
• Establishing predator proof bomas.

Relationships between communities and other key stakeholders

Conservation on the ground:
• Communities lease land to tour operators for eco-tourism business. E.g Oldonyo lodge, Satao Elarai.
• Conservation organizations provide social benefits to communities such as education/scholarship, employment, health care water provision and enhance community security.
• KWS pays bursaries from fees collected at the park.
• Establishing predator proof bomas e.g. Born Free Foundation and Big Life.

Other initiatives:
• Cultural bomas
• Livestock market, e.g. Mbirikani livestock market, Kimana.
• Slaughter house-Mbirikani
• Cross-Border anti-poaching efforts.
• Kenya-Tanzania cross border operations. This is a collaboration between, Big Life, Honeyguide, KWS, AWF

Issues raised in subsequent group discussions:
• Rombo is a major poaching hotspot
• There is extensive cross border anti-poaching collaboration with the Honeyguide Foundation, KWS and AWF on cross-border patrols,
• Collaboration with TAWIRI (surveys, research) and KWS-TANAPA-Wildlife division
• Population statistics from area come from Kenya Bureau of Statistics report
• Main agricultural crops: tomatoes, maize, bean
• Bursaries are allocated by communities
• The Maasai Olympics event was created to provide Maasai Morans (warriors) an alternative way to compete and to show their prowess (instead of each killing a lion which is not sustainable)
• Specifically trained local community rangers monitor human wildlife conflict HWC
• Consolation payments handled by an advisory committee, which solves dispute, each zone is presented on the committee. The Advisory Committee, Validation officers and predator scouts are in place to ensure the system is very transparent. Running since 2003, collecting data on HWC since 2002 (MPT before BLF from 2010). BLF has department that analyzes all the data to see the impacts.
• Consolation schemes funded 30% by community 70% by BLF; there is some evidence that these are working, poaching lower where consolation
• Consolation is not compensation. It does not pay market value for losses
• Compensation/consolation is a default knee jerk reaction – not dealing with root causes, not changing behaviour
• Kenya government struggles to pay compensation – currently only processing claims for injury to people and loss of human life; happy to see BLF fill that gap; but raises sustainability issue, what happens if payments stop?
• As a result of better protection wildlife numbers increasing, animals becoming “more relaxed” and HWC increasing. There has been high loss of human life – “have lost a person every weekend”
• Problem animal control sometimes used as a pretext for poaching and mortalities attributed to HWC even if poaching for ivory might be the real motive. This needs to be dealt with as a priority;
• Land use planning the key for HWC in the long term but need a balance approach, look at predator-prey densities, lions increasing in some areas and turning to eating livestock
• Possibility of national level insurance for HWC should be explored with insurance companies, expecting govt. to pay for this from recurrent budgets or donor funds not sustainable and has failed wherever it has been tried. This could be something to raise with the new Director of KWS
• Wildlife can provide cash benefits and cultural benefits, both are important, need to widen the range of benefits.
• REDD+ scheme at Mbirikani could provide a new source of sustainable funding? Verification scheduled for June 2016.

Engaging communities in conservation - A SOUTH RIFT COMMUNITY INITIATIVE - John Kamanga, SORALO

See presentation. Summary:
The SORALO area is huge (850,000 ha) and links the Maasai Mara and Amboseli landscapes along the Kenya-Tanzania border – see map. Series of group ranches, established conservancies – Shompole & Olkiramatian – several others proposed, under development.

The model is to “make wildlife the story”. Conservancies as hubs for development. Planning to operationalize 10 conservancies. Funding a big challenge.

Mainly arid lands, suitable for livestock keeping, opportunities for continued wildlife-livestock co-existence. Need to adopt a landscape approach to conservation.

See presentation for details, a few highlights:
• Important transboundary movements of elephants -see map below – also other wildlife moving across border; need to secure long-term viability of corridors. Pastoralists also need the same mobility, using the same corridors.
• Land use is changing rapidly, increased subdivision, agriculture in favour of livestock.
• Large wildlife populations of iconic species use the area. Long term wildlife population data
  exists thanks to long-term research on elephants, carnivores and other species, summaries of
  some presented – see slides. Research Centre exists and has database on wildlife, HWC,
  poaching. Monitoring and research not just on wildlife but human indicators as well.
• Data shows an overall increasing trend in wildlife populations, increased protection due to
  conservancies
• Detailed mapping of elephant poaching incidents across – see presentation

Why should we conserve this space?

• Lesser flamingoes in Magadi-Natron a conservation asset of global significance.
• Loita Forest of cultural significance to the Maasai, important for biodiversity, including a refuge
  for elephants, water catchment.
• Main threats include changing land use – subdivision, agriculture and poaching.
• Poaching of growing concern and mainly targets elephants. Poachers mainly coming from
  outside the community. Loita Hills and Nguruman are poaching hotspots. These hills extend into
  Tanzania, easy for poachers to gain access from across the border
• Illegal and unsustainable Sandalwood extraction takes place in the area.
• Community scouts are engaged and trained in anti-poaching and data collection. Ex-poachers
  turned into scouts.
• Community conservancies provide benefits and are key to wildlife conservation; “the closer we
  get to community ownership of wildlife the better”
• Wildlife is integrated to traditional livestock economy
• Securing sufficient investment in wildlife is a challenge. BLF area of operation receiving 20 times
  the investment
• There is a need to diversify – promote cultural tourism products in additional to wildlife based
  enterprises; but options are limited e.g. bird shooting or other hunting is prohibited, sustainable
  and regulated trade in Sandalwood not legal;
• HWC is a major issue. Leading to human injuries and death, livestock depredation, crop damage, damage to infrastructure and property. Species involved include lion, leopard, hyena and elephant.
• Lion population used to be 10-20. Now it is 80. Lion-human conflict on the increase
• HWC mitigation strategies: education and awareness raising, land use planning/zonation, establishment of community conservancies and benefit sharing

Key stakeholders:
• SORALO – lead conservation agency (technical advice)
• KWS – overall responsible national body
• County government – Kajiado & Narok – enactment of by-laws, spatial planning
• CWCC- approval of conservancy management plans
• Group ranch committees – help with community participation in decision-making process
• Conservancy committees – management of community conservancies – act as link to SORALO and other conservation bodies
• Other conservation NGOs in Kenya (particularly ACC) and in Tanzania
• Researchers and scientists – sharing information for better understanding and for management

Relationships between communities and other stakeholders:
• Cordial relationships with KWS, conservation NGOs, political groups, security personnel (national govt.)
• Cross-border collaboration with TANAPA, Wildlife Division and WMAs
• Few private sector investors & tourism partners
• Magadi Soda Company

Issues raised in the subsequent group discussion:
• Connection between SORALO and Olderekesi – need to secure wildlife corridors and unprotected areas
• The genesis of the project came from the initial ecotourism investment at Shompole, since then scaled out elsewhere; important to demonstrate success
• Management structures should conform with traditional structures, important to embed this in the livestock economy, see the situation “through the eyes of a cow” to ensure local buy in and to adapt to local context
• Over-reliance on tourism is a risky strategy as has been demonstrated in Kenya in recent years
• Explore partnerships with Magadi Soda, KenGen, etc. corporate responsibility strategies; there is now oil exploration at Magadi
• Explore PES and diversify away from tourism
• How do you ensure more of the benefit from wildlife reaches the communities?

**Legal and Policy Framework for Conservancies and IWT in Kenya – Dickson Kaelo – KWCA**

See detailed presentation shared via dropbox. Summary of outline and contents:

• Kenya in context – established conservancies represent 7.1% of protected area estate (preliminary figures, projected to be a much larger proportion). Most wildlife (65%) is on private and community lands.
• Kenya’s “Green” Constitution 2010 – Article 69
  ▪ Sustainable exploitation, equitable sharing of benefits
- Strong focus on public participation
- Plethora of environment and natural resources policies and laws, many undergoing review – Wildlife Act, Forest Act, Climate change Bill, EMCA, water Act, Land Act, Community land Bill, Finance Act,

- Multiple CBNR Institutions:
  1. Community and private conservancy & sanctuary (WCMA Sec 39)
  2. Community wildlife Association (WCMA Sec 40)
  3. Community Forest Association (CFA)
  4. Water Resources Users Association (WRUA)
  5. Community Managed Marine Areas

- From the 1970s, there has been a long evolution towards the inclusion of communities in wildlife management. Culminating in the Wildlife Act of 2013. Before the Act, the conservancies acted without a policy framework – allowed experimentation and innovation, flexibility in taking advantage of local situations

- Many models developed, many variants of each model
  - Land leasing models in the Mara
  - Community conservation areas in Northern Kenya
  - Privately owned conservancies adopting mixed livestock/wildlife
  - Tourism investors partnerships in Amboseli and Laikipia
  - Payment for Ecosystem services in Tsavo

Wildlife Conservation and Management Act 2013 (effective Jan 2014)

1. Devolution of wildlife management to landowners and communities
2. Enhanced legal requirements for effective participation of public
3. Recognition of conservation as a recognized land use – possible inclusion in national plans and budgets – Several mechanisms made possible; Game farms, Game ranch, conservancy, sanctuary, easement, protected wetland
4. Recognition of & regulations for conservancies, empowering of community rangers (scouts), introduction of wildlife user rights, requirements for Management Plans
5. Recognition of need for reduction of costs of living with wildlife through compensation – life, injury, crops, livestock and property
6. Strong penalties for wildlife crime e.g. US$250,000 or life in prison for engaging in crime on endangered species

Conservancies in Kenya – see map in presentation.

- Status: 140 conservancies (119 KWCA members) community, group and private conservancies and over 40 emerging or proposed in 25 counties
- Multiple purposes: Community Institution, community development, wildlife and tourism security, community social cohesion, land use planning, grazing planning and land restoration, tourism, income diversification, protection of endangered species
- Varying levels of landscape level coordination e.g. stronger in NRT, Mara, Soralo and Amboseli, weak in Rift lakes, Athi Kapiti and Tsavo
- Collective values (ecological, social and economic) of Conservancies are yet to be determined
- Policy environment and governance regimes are evolving e.g. County Govt. growing support
Policy challenges:

- Strong private land tenure, strong focus on income per unit area of land
- Relatively weaker community land regime, stronger ability to benefit from conservation
- Multiple ENR laws and policies some needing harmonization
- Slow rate of policy review and implementation
- Weak incentives for conservation

Issues arising from subsequent group discussions:

- Collective values (ecological, social and economic) of Conservancies are yet to be determined.
- Policy environment and governance regimes are evolving.
- Very high tax burden (land taxes, etc.) acting as disincentive to establish conservancies, private sector involvement in wildlife enterprises

Day 2: 24th May 2016

The day started with a recap by Leo of lessons learned the previous day. This was followed a by a presentation from Wendy Rowe on the next steps in the action research process. Next, the participants engaged in a session on stakeholder analysis.

Presentation – Professor Wendy Rowe

Part B: Creating the Team and Enlisting Other Stakeholders to Implement Action Research

Part C: Reconnaissance and first phase engaging stakeholders

The full presentation has been shared via dropbox. An outline and summary of content is provided as follows:

Role of the action researcher
facilitator, not expert,
to engage stakeholders in co-creating new knowledge and empowering them to make decisions,
technical skills in data collection and data analysis,
Synthesis skills – facilitate stakeholders to make sense (meaning making)

**Action research Core Team**

- Typically 2-5 people
  - Project coordinator
  - Dedicated project staff /experts in community interventions
  - Action researcher
  - Evaluator /other researchers
- Committed for duration of the initiative

**Extended stakeholders**

- Tend to be revolving – come and go with different action/activities
- May range in number depending on actions
- Community members
- Agency staff
- Temporary experts, when needed
- Volunteers
- People who understand community – have legitimacy
- Specialists in specific types of actions (e.g. law enforcement)

**More on reconnaissance**

- Understand the socio-political and historical context
  - Past issues/needs – history of interventions – success/failures and reasons why
  - Community (or organizational) demographics
  - Community history of involvement or lack of
  - History of relationship with coordinating agency
  - Who are the stakeholders who should be involved
- Examine baseline data/problem data/needs – define the extent and nature of problems
- Establish general purpose and direction of project
- Create core team and primary stakeholder team
- orientation workshop to get everyone on the same page

**More on first cycle of Action**

- Establish (Confirm) Goals and Strategies
- Plan first action steps in pursuit of goals
- Use inquiry and dialogue to engage extended stakeholders in action steps
- Support community involvement in actions
- Evaluate results of action through
  - data collection/measurement on activities, outputs and outcomes,
  - systematic data analysis and meaning making
- Reflect and then revise goals and/or action plans
Deliberate on organizational/community actions/interventions

Change options

Re-contextualize and reconstruct for organizational change

**Engaging and committing primary and extended stakeholders**

- Invite them into a change initiative
- Share purpose of initiative based on identified issues, opportunity or goal
- Share data on needs/problems
- Share project objectives and initial plan of action
- Engage key stakeholders in inquiry process
  - Collaborative dialogue and deliberation
  - Involve them in data collection in response to questions
- Establish roles and action for community stakeholders

**Why this “Engagement Process” is Important?**

- To create a common knowledge base on the problems and issues – why change is necessary
- To empower all parties – vision and goals
- To create common understanding and acceptance of the strategies/intervention actions
- To identify areas of ambivalence or resistance – work to resolve
- To demonstrate inclusivity of all voices
- To learn from everybody’s perspective and opinions
- To overcome inertia and negativity about change

**Benefits of engaging stakeholders**

- Leaders become inspired, more knowledgeable and supportive of stakeholders’ pace of change
- Stakeholders are included – valued
- Stakeholders learn and shift perspectives
- Stakeholders become engaged and committed to change goals and actions
- Organization increases its readiness to embrace change – overcomes resistance to change

**IT TAKES TIME for SUCCESSFUL CHANGE to HAPPEN**

**Action Research Encourages Learning and Change in Implementing the Intervention**

- Does not have a pre-determined definition of problem or issue
- Does not have a fixed strategy, solution or intervention strategy – it is adaptable
- Based on inquiry processes to learn more about the issue and the possibilities
- Encourages change in perspectives and mental models about the issues
- Creates new possibilities
- Is appreciative and positive
- Is not top down or bottom up but rather inclusive and collaborative, to include multiple stakeholders
- Implementation becomes the responsibility of multiple stakeholders, not simply a manager or project leader

**Stakeholder analysis**

It is critical for the inception phase to accurately and comprehensively identify to key stakeholders that the project will engage with. The workshop participants worked in groups to identify the names
of stakeholders at national, district/regional, county and local levels. These stakeholders were mapped against the four pathways of the overarching theory of change in order to identify which of the pathways they had potential knowledge, authority or influence on. The preliminary lists of stakeholders in each site have been shared through the dropbox folder. These lists are currently being finalized by the partners and will be used to guide the design of the next stages of the project.

Day 3: 25th May 2016

Situation analysis tool for community engagement in combating IWT
The participants spent a considerable amount of time testing a prototype situation assessment tool, structured along the main pathways of the overarching theory of change which proved extremely useful in helping the participants to quickly gain insights into the main challenges and opportunities at site level through a highly interactive and participatory approach. The testing of the tool resulted in improvements being made to the tool itself. The situation assessment sheets for the three pilot sites were shared with all participants via dropbox.

The assessment results are automatically displayed in the form of “star diagrams” giving a quick snapshot of the situation on the ground. An example is given below for Ol Derekesi – an overall summary and one of the Pathways (A).
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Community perceptions

In order to get an insight into community perceptions on wildlife and the legitimate and illegitimate killing of wildlife, the participants from the sites were asked to work in groups and consider the following questions:

1. When you think about the wildlife in your area, what comes to mind?
2. When is the killing of an elephant, rhinos or lion in your area unacceptable?
3. When is the killing of an elephant or lion in your area Justified or Legitimate?
4. What actions have you found to be best in preventing unacceptable killing?
5. What are the challenges in preventing unacceptable killings?
6. Is justifiable killing supported by the law? In what way or not?

This exercise helped to provide an interesting overview of many traditional beliefs about wildlife that still play a strong role in Maasai societies and help regulate behavior. It was noted however that these beliefs and cultural values are being lost rapidly. Land use is also changing leading to loss of habitat and increased human-wildlife conflict which is leading to more killing of wildlife in retaliation for loss of human life, livestock and damage to crops and property. The need for benefits to flow to affected communities was raised. Slow response times by KWS to problem animal incidents are forcing communities to take matters into their own hands.
Selection of the pilot conservancy

In light of the very large areas covered by Big Life and SORALO, it was decided that each of these partners should select just one conservancy in their areas of operation which would serve as the pilot site for the current project. The criteria used for selection of the conservancy were agreed as follows:

1. It should be an established conservancy with formal structures
2. It should have a reasonable amount of data available on wildlife, illegal killing, etc., as relates to the 4 pathways of the ToC
3. It should have a point person who can help with data collection, community liaison and logistics

Based on these criteria the following conservancies were selected:

1. Satao Elerai – focal point Anthony Kasanga
2. Shompole- Olkiramatian – focal point Samson Lenjirr

For Olderekesi, James Kaigil was nominated as the Focal Point for the project.

Indicators for Program Baseline and Performance Tracking

In the next part of the workshop the participants were facilitated through an exercise of inventorying the data that exists at site level that would be required for establishment of the project baseline and subsequent performance tracking. Gaps in data and sources of external information were also noted. The indicators used in this exercise, which were adapted from the impact indicators of Global Wildlife Programme, were as follows:

1. Hectares of land under the following land governance categories
   - Condition of land using 6-point scale (and remote sensing if available)
   - Does the area have a land use plan (Y/N - or simple expert system)
   - Is the land use plan implemented (Y/N - or simple expert system)
2. Wildlife populations
   - Best estimate of numbers for:
     - Elephant
     - Rhino
     - Big cats
     - Antelope
     - Other species
3. Livestock numbers
4. Indicators on threats and opportunities
   - Animals poached for illegal wildlife trade
   - Animals poached for bushmeat
   - Animals killed in retaliation (problem animal control)
   - Illegal activity (other)
   - Other incidents, e.g. disease, fire, invasive species, etc.
   - Enabling conditions for anti-poaching in neighbouring communities
   - Human wildlife conflict
5. Socio-economic indicators
   - Human populations
   - Livelihoods
   - Attitudes to wildlife, parks and conservation
• Benefits
  ▪ Rights
  ▪ Tangible benefits
  ▪ Intangible benefits

6. Community capacity to act for conservation
7. Development of wildlife and alternative economy
   ▪ Private parks/wildlife-based business
   ▪ Community small enterprises directly related to parks and wildlife
   ▪ New non-wildlife related businesses directly related to the project

8. Input indicators
   ▪ Law enforcement
     ▪ Patrol staff
     ▪ Patrol days / investigation days
     ▪ Animals killed (target species, other species)
     ▪ Arrests
     ▪ Is there a system for tracking investigations Y/N
     ▪ Is there a system for tracking preparation of evidence and success of prosecutions Y/N

The results of this exercise for the three conservancies is provided in Annex III to this report.

There was a brief discussion about the methodology for collection of baseline data. It was acknowledged that quite a bit of data already exists but also that there are quite substantial gaps. These include monitoring of “intangibles” the social attitudes on wildlife, pride and community values. Some data is with third parties % of revenues reaching communities might be with tourism operators, KWS may have certain other data not available at site level. An archival data collection form will be designed and the data therein should be collected by site level implementers over the next two months and sent to Leo by the end of July.

The data assessment tool needs to be refined, translated into Maa, tested, and improved again. This will be an iterative process. Currently the tool uses a scale of 0-6, need to think of a culturally appropriate scale. The tool will be used with small focus groups 3-7 each: 1) men 2) women 3) youth, this will be a highly interactive process, a power point projector will be required. There will have to be note takers to help record to points raised and report back to core research team. KWCA should be able to help with this. Will need several people involved at site level, coordinated by the respective Focal points, Anthony, Samson & James.

Once the tool has been customized and translated into Maa, the implementers need get together for a ½-1 day meeting to ensure the way the questions are posed is harmonized across sites. Leo will liaise with the site focal points regarding time and venue.

It would be better to have the meeting with men in the morning and the meetings with women and youth in the afternoon. It is very difficult to do anything before 10 AM or after 3PM. It would be important to identify and train a lady in the communities who would do the consultation with the women’s group.

There will also be a separate community gathering (30-40 people) a baraza with food and drink, this will be open to a broader group but needs to have representation from the three demographic groups (men, women, youth); duration about 2 hours around 11AM- 1PM (?); the results from the assessment tool exercise will be shared, there will also be a series of broad questions. These will need to be recorded and reported back to the research team. It will be important to have
community elders and “gate keepers” at the baraza. The participants should be seated in tables in small groups, each with a leader and a note taker who would report to the research team a summary after each question.

To make all this happen the research team would need to spend 3-5 days on site and would need to work with site focal points throughout this time, plus on technical preparations in advance of the site visits.

For the site assessment exercise a Power Point projector is required. Apparently both sites can provide this. Suitable venues: School Olderekesi, a hall in Kimani town? At Satao Elerai Lodge?

The results of the field work will be consolidated and shared with communities at a meeting in early 2017. This will bring both communities together to exchange ideas and lessons learned. This feedback from the communities will further assist with the subsequent production of case studies from the two sites.

Review of Theory of change based on feedback to date
The facilitators provided a summary of feedback to date on the overarching theory of change:

- Overdevelopment from tourism can be a threat
- Local ownership (decisions, information, benefits) is central
- Threats need to be better articulated
- ‘Common threats’ contribute to a cohesiveness of purpose – e.g. personal security, pressure of agriculture
- Community rangers / scouts have multiple values to the community but need training, incentives and management
- Limited wildlife benefits streams constrain what can be achieved
- Conservancy level rules and norms are critical
- New Wildlife Act both supports and restricts
- Making transparent the links and responsibility / accountability to conservation-funded investments
- Community taboos are a strong part of social norms
- Traditional HWC mitigation measures exist and need to be considered and captured
- Need third parties to assist but not control
- Financial viability of wildlife enterprise is critical– investments, markets, taxes, - the burden on investors can be overwhelming, there are serious sustainability concerns, especially on relying only on wildlife revenue streams
- Sustainability of other funding streams – donors, industry, self-generated
- Cash economy has led to both positive and negative outcomes for wildlife
- No ‘prior informed consent’ principles need to be operationalized to deal with development initiatives on community lands
- Lack of KWS capacity and engagement leads to communities “taking matters into their own hands” (this has positive and negative impacts / aspects)
- Need full devolution of benefits and further equitable distribution to: individuals, communities, management of resources.
- Defining understanding “your community” is critical.

Essential enabling conditions:

- Land use plan
• Information system
• Investment conditions
• Information for decision-making, accountability, ability to demonstrate performance.

Group work on the ToC
In the following session the site implementers worked in a group to independently review the overarching ToC seen from their site-specific perspectives. The feedback was then reported back into plenary. Key points:

Pathway A

• Communities have to understand the framework law, this is a crucial enabling activity. The case of a Chinese citizen being fined KES 250,000 for an ivory offence had huge impact in terms of raising awareness of the penalties. For bushmeat or many other infractions the dynamic is not the same
• Social aspects matter, it is important to strengthen traditional values and social structures to combat poaching - public shaming those who guilty of poaching and associate social stigmas can be powerful
• Social norms a being eroded, many young people do not know about them to the frustration of the elders. These norms need to be brought back through conservancy-led education programmes

Pathway B

• Strengthen/start activities to generate and equitably share benefits – this is vital
• Perceptions really matter. If communities perceive that benefit distribution is not equitable, the scheme will not work no matter how outsiders perceive it. This is even more important than the amount of the benefit received
• Equitable doesn't mean all get the same amount, but transparency on who is getting what is central to acceptability by the community
• Rephrase “build community capacity to manage wildlife related enterprises” to read: “strengthen / start activities to generate and equitably share financial benefits for wildlife”
• In this pathway it would be more appropriate to talk about benefits rather than incentives
• Strengthen the link between wildlife and conservation benefits – make it more visible to communities e.g. a school may have been financed through conservation funding but there is not clear attribution to the reason why it was funded
• Strengthen incentives for wildlife conservation through policies and laws – this is a government responsibility
• Rewarding good stewardship is important but – how? How to reward those who stand out? How do we recognize good performance e.g. tourism gold standard? It is important for community motivation. Individuals should be recognized too and would fit well within the cultural context of Maasai communities. Possibly it would be good to design something against a standard – this could link to/draw from the IUCN Green List process?
• It is very important to focus on reducing the recruitment of new poachers and understanding why and how they get recruited, instead of just on those already know to be poaching; add a box into ToC on this at outcome level
Pathway C

- This not just about HWC in the sense it is normally understood – livestock predation, crop damage, human death & injuries but should also consider wildlife-livestock/human disease transmission e.g. malignant cathartic fever.
- Also competition for pasture - wildebeest come in millions and take over pastures
- There are high indirect costs e.g. children prevented from walking to school due to the presence of large dangerous wildlife
- Look at how communities can mitigate these problems using traditional methods
- Have to look at better land use planning to minimize conflict interface

Pathway D

- These alternative livelihoods have to be compatible with wildlife conservation efforts or complimentary to them. They should be conditional benefits i.e. provided as reward on performance on anti-poaching and wildlife conservation. This therefore loops back to pathway A

Other points discussed:

- If there was legal wildlife trade this could provide a wider range of wildlife-based benefits. Ostrich farming and tortoise trade are examples. Some legal trade will be possible under the new act but some of these options carry big risk: Extensive farming of species for regulated trade can be abused need to be managed so that there isn’t overexploitation. There is a risk of open access to these resources once legalized as we have seen in the past. Ostrich, reptiles and markets for many other species need a continuous supply of a large volume of animals, which can easily become unsustainable and are difficult to regulate effectively. This is not so much the case with many of the traditionally sport-hunted animals e.g. elephant, buffalo, lion, which could bring in large benefits but would require the removal of relatively few animals reducing risks to species, and would be easier to manage and monitor. Sport-hunting, event bird shooting, however, is not permitted in the new Act.
- Kenya needs to move away from the notion that wildlife can ever really fully pay for itself, or help lift people out of poverty.

Day 5 27th of May 2016

At the start of the last day of the workshop, the facilitators (Holly & Diane) presented a re-organization of the ToC based on the feedback received. Key points & issues:

Additional primary outcome added to the ToC: **reduced recruitment of community members into poaching**

Pathway A

Summary of feedback from the site implementers as presented the previous day (see also above). Key issues:

- Conservancy level rules and norms
- Community rangers / scouts have multiple values to the community but need training, incentives and management
- Strengthening the traditional values that will protect wildlife generation (naming and shaming, etc.)
- Communities need to understand the framework of the wildlife conservation law: education, training, empowerment, etc.

Pathway B
Summary of feedback from the site implementers as presented the previous day (see also above).
Key issues:
- Diversify wildlife-related benefit streams
- Need full devolution of benefits and further equitable distribution to individuals, communities, management of resources
- Sustainability of funding streams – donors, industry, self-generated
- Rewarding stewardship – HOW?
- Strengthen link between wildlife and conservation benefits (process and programme)
- Strengthen incentivizing policies & laws

Pathway C
Summary of feedback from the site implementers as presented the previous day (see also above).
Key issues:
- Traditional HWC mitigation measures exist
- Reduce other costs of living with wildlife (e.g., cost associated with disease, loss of access to water, pasture, etc.)
- Do land use planning and natural resource management where it is not already done or being done.

Pathway D
Summary of feedback from the site implementers as presented the previous day (see also above).
Key issues:
- Alternative livelihoods need to be compatible / complementary
- Strengthen link between alternative livelihoods and anti-poaching
- Ensure conditionality of alternative livelihoods with anti-poaching

Enabling conditions / Actions
- Land use plan
- Information system
- Information for decision-making, accountability, demonstrate performance
- Defining and understanding your community is critical
- Local ownership – Decisions, information, benefits is central
- Supportive, not controlling roles of third Parties
- To achieve sustainability you need positive tax incentives, access to markets, willing investors
- Make transparent the links and responsibility / accountability to conservation-funded investments
Threats

- Overdevelopment of tourism
- Threats need to be better articulated
- No ‘prior informed consent’ to deal with development initiatives on community land
- Limited wildlife-related benefit streams
- New WL act raises the prospect of uncontrolled harvest of some species

Context of the mixed wildlife-livestock economy

- New Wildlife Act both supports and restricts
- Lack of KWS capacity and engagement leads to communities taking matters into their own hands
- Cash economy has led to positive and negative effects
- Common threats can lead to cohesiveness of purpose e.g. personal security, pressure of agriculture
- Communities’ taboos are a strong part of the social norms.

Wrap-up and next steps

Before closure of the meeting there was a discussion about the next steps in the project. A broad outline of activities was agreed as follows:

1. Assessment of data generated from workshop, refining theory of change, conservancy assessment tool, workshop report, finalization of archival data collection form, key informant questionnaire, set up dropbox folder, finalize detailed project Gantt chart – June
2. Data collection all sites: June –July. To be submitted to IUCN by 31st of July.
3. Meeting of site focal points to harmonise Maa translation of site assessment tool – mid-July
4. Site visit – Satao Elerai – second half of August
5. Assessment of data from Satao Elerai key interviews, work on lessons for case study, revision of tools and ToC: August – December
6. Site visit(s) Shompole/Olkiramati & Olderekesi – mid October
7. Assessment of data from site visit, work on case studies, revision of tools and ToC – October-December
8. Community workshop to give feedback from the interviews, exchange lessons between sites – Jan-Feb 2017
9. KWCA meeting to share lessons from the project, do a broader consultation with KWCA members, possibly using the assessment tool, and formulate recommendations for policy – February 2017 (TBC)

Leo will be in touch with all focal points to further refine and unpack the above and to discuss specific activities, responsibilities and timelines. Leo will act as overall coordinator of the project in close liaison with the site focal points. All relevant documents will be shared via dropbox as well as by email as practical.

The meeting was officially closed at 12PM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dickson Ole Kaelo</td>
<td>Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dkaelo@kwcakenya.com">dkaelo@kwcakenya.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kaigil</td>
<td>Olderkesi Conservancy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jkaigil@yahoo.com">Jkaigil@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Lenjirr</td>
<td>SORALO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:koreslenjirr@gmail.com">koreslenjirr@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kamanga</td>
<td>SORALO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.olekamanga@gmail.com">j.olekamanga@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Silantoi</td>
<td>SORALO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:silantoiole@yahoo.com">silantoiole@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Woodley</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alphadeltawhiskey@gmail.com">alphadeltawhiskey@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Kahihia</td>
<td>Kenya Wildlife Service</td>
<td><a href="mailto:annkahihia@kws.go.ke">annkahihia@kws.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Kasanga</td>
<td>Big Life Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:data@biglife.org">data@biglife.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson Leyan</td>
<td>Amboseli Ecosystem Trust</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ntoyianleyan@yahoo.com">ntoyianleyan@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikala Lauridsen</td>
<td>USAID East Africa</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mlauridsen@usaid.gov">mlauridsen@usaid.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Dublin</td>
<td>IUCN SSC AfESG/IUCN ESARO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:holly.dublin@gmail.com">holly.dublin@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Rowe</td>
<td>Royal Roads University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Wendy.Rowe@RoyalRoads.ca">Wendy.Rowe@RoyalRoads.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Skinner</td>
<td>IUCN SSC CEESP SULi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:skinner.diane@gmail.com">skinner.diane@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Niskanen</td>
<td>IUCN ESARO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Leo.Niskanen@iucn.org">Leo.Niskanen@iucn.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex II

Strengthening local community engagement in combating illegal wildlife trade – project inception workshop

23rd-27th May 2016

IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office, Wasaa Conservation Centre, off Mukoma Road, Langata, Nairobi

DAY 1: Monday 23rd May 2016: Project Inception Workshop

9.00-9.30: Welcome, introductions & workshop objectives - Leo Niskanen

9.30-10.30: Background, project activities & objectives – Holly Dublin, Wendy Rowe, Leo Niskanen

10.30-11.00 Coffee break

11.00 – 13.00 Presentation of baseline information

   ▪ 11.00-11.30 Olderekesi Conservancy – Cottars Safari Services
   ▪ 11.30-12.00 Amboseli – Big Life Foundation
   ▪ 12.00-12.30 SORALO

13.00-14.00 Lunch

14.00-14.30 Policy and legislative framework relevant to communities and IWT – Dickson Ole Kaelo

14.30-15.00 Coffee break

15.00-16.30 Project work plan – tentative activities, timelines and responsibilities among partners (to be refined further during the Action Research training the development of methodological framework, Day 2-5)

16.30-17.30 Wrap up and next steps
DAY 2: Tuesday 24th May 2016 – Training in Action Research methodology & development of research plan

9.00 – 9.30: Recap of Day 1 and introduction to Day 2 – Leo Niskanen

9.30-10.00: Session 1: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT (general principles of AR & how to adapt them to project context) – Dr. Wendy Rowe

10.30-10.45. Coffee break

10.45-13.00: Group exercise – enabling conditions for community engagement – using the community conservation tool

13.00-14.00 Lunch

14.00-15.30 Stakeholder assessment – who are the key stakeholders to engage with in the pilot sites

15.30-16.00: Session 1: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT (general principles of AR & how to adapt them to project context) – Dr. Wendy Rowe

16.00-17.00 Session 2: Establishing goals and processes for project – Dr. Wendy Rowe

DAY 3: Wednesday 25th of May 2016 – Training in Action Research methodology & development of research plan - Detailed agenda TBD

9.00-9.30 Recap of lessons from Day 2 & training agenda for Day 3 – Dr. Wendy Rowe

9.30-10.00 Olderekesi assessment – Diane

   Comparison of three sites across the four strategies/pathways

10.00-10.15 – coffee break

10.15-13.00 Session 3: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT – understanding the community perceptions on needs, wrongful killing and justifiable killing – differences in perceptions

- how will the community want to be engaged in wildlife protection; promoting community ownership of lifestyle protection - Dr Wendy Rowe

   • Interactive group work
   • Plenary sessions

13.00-1400: Lunch

14.00-1630: Session 4: Data Needs for Baseline Assessment and Performance Indicators – Holly Dublin and Wendy Rowe

   • Interactive group work
   • Plenary sessions

16.30-17.00 Recap of lessons from Day 3 & training agenda for Day 4
DAY 4: Thursday 26th of May 2016 – Training in Action Research methodology & development of research plan - Detailed agenda TBD

9.00-9.30 Introduction to Day 4 – Dr. Wendy Rowe

9.30-13.00 Session 5: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT – Dr Wendy Rowe
  - Interactive group work
  - Plenary sessions

1300-1400: Lunch

14.00-1630: Session 6: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT – Dr Wendy Rowe
  - Interactive group work
  - Plenary sessions

16.30-17.00 Recap of lessons from Day 4 & training agenda for Day 5

DAY 5: Friday 27th of May 2016 – Training in Action Research methodology & development of research plan - Detailed agenda TBD

9.00-9.30 Introduction to Day 5 – Dr. Wendy Rowe

9.30-12.00 Session: Action Research for strengthened community engagement in combating IWT – Dr Wendy Rowe
  - Interactive group work
  - Plenary sessions

12.00-13.00: Summary, conclusions and next steps

1300-1400: Lunch

END of WORKSHOP
### Annex III – Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GWP Impact indicators</th>
<th>Indicators for Program Baseline and Performance Tracking</th>
<th>Olderekesi</th>
<th>Satao Eleraí</th>
<th>Shompole - Olkiramatian</th>
<th>Data needed from external stakeholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hectares of land under the following land governance categories</td>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PA- state (National Park, National Forest)</td>
<td>Condition of land using 6-point scale (and remote sensing if available)</td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PA - Co-management</td>
<td>Does the area have a land use plan (Y/N - or simple expert system)</td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PA- community conserved area</td>
<td>Is the land use plan implemented (Y/N - or simple expert system)</td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production - open access community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production - closed access (private) community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Production - private individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - size of conservancy, Yes - land use plan, Yes - quality of rangeland</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes, LUP, No - quality of rangeland (wants to), LUP is in action but not being monitored</td>
<td>Yes - size, Yes - LUP, Yes - quality of rangeland (qual and quant), Yes - LUP is being implemented and reports on how it is working</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife populations</td>
<td>Best estimate of numbers for:</td>
<td>Ranger (and tourist guide) sightings for elephant, rhino, cats (individual ID for cheetah), wild dogs. Nothing for antelope. Recorded daily in occurrence book, compiled into monthly reports</td>
<td>Ranger (and tourist guide) sightings for elephant, cats, antelope. Recorded daily on paper and then entered into computer</td>
<td>Collared elephants for movement; individual herds and numbers well-known; annual aerial counts (wet and dry) with DSRS; lions monitored - individuals known and tracked; sightings recorded of wild dog, leopard and cheetah. Captured in a central database and monthly reports. Local research team with international researchers</td>
<td>KWS, Elephant Voices, Amboseli Elephant Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock numbers</td>
<td>Approximate estimates - between 5K - 6K</td>
<td>Last estimate was 2010 - would like to track. DRFRS may have this.</td>
<td>DRFRS</td>
<td>DRFRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATORS OF THREATS/OPPORTUNITIES</td>
<td>Number of each species</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>All information is shared with KWS - in some cases KWS feeds back to the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals poached for illegal wildlife trade</td>
<td>Number of each species</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>All information is shared with KWS - in some cases KWS feeds back to the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals poached for bushmeat</td>
<td>Number of each species</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>All information is shared with KWS - in some cases KWS feeds back to the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals killed in retaliation (problem animal control)</td>
<td>Number of each species</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>Ranger-based monitoring data, compiled monthly, shared with KWS, veterinary treatment records. Collaborative meeting annually with neighbours to reconcile data. Data coded by type of incident. Standardized with neighbours. Developing book on the protocol.</td>
<td>All information is shared with KWS - in some cases KWS feeds back to the stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal activity</td>
<td>Snares, bows &amp; arrows, poison, etc</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other incidents, e.g. disease, fire, invasive species, etc.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td>Not tracked at the moment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling conditions for anti-poaching in neighbouring communities</td>
<td>Five point score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human wildlife conflict</td>
<td>Number of incidents</td>
<td>Sheep / wild dogs - how many sheep are killed, who does the sheep belong</td>
<td>Track incident, type, acreage of destruction and type of crop, Records kept and submitted to CWCC/KWS. Individual records</td>
<td>KWS compensation claims and payouts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO-ECONOMIC INDICATORS</td>
<td>Type (human life, human injury, damage property, livestock, crop)</td>
<td>too, how many wild dogs were seen, (photos). Captured on paper and in MIST. Information shared with Chiefs and KWS. Don't track compensation payouts or claims</td>
<td>time of raid, number of elephants in incident, infrastructure loss, number of stock, number of predators, whether the 'owner' used mitigation methods and which ones, standard of boma, claims and payouts. Whether or not KWS was informed. Compiled in individual records, central database, and reports.</td>
<td>held by Conservancy. CWCC compiles (not sure of frequency) - meant to be public data. KWS County Office also keep a full set of records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human population</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Census data (every 10 years) and county data (annual) accessible - finer resolution data might be available from group ranch / chief</td>
<td>Census data (every 10 years) and county data (annual) accessible - finer resolution data should be available from group ranch / chief</td>
<td>Census data (every 10 years) and county data (annual) accessible - finer resolution data should be available from group ranch / chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>Was a survey conducted Y/N</td>
<td>Knowledge on the disbursements from the lease - other livelihoods likely not known</td>
<td>Nothing available</td>
<td>Samantha - collecting data using PRAs - annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes to wildlife, parks and conservation</td>
<td>Five point scale</td>
<td>Not known - need to check with Calvin</td>
<td>HWC / attitudes survey - early 2015, and early 2016</td>
<td>Samantha - collecting data using PRAs - annual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rights</th>
<th>% of value of wildlife economy (tourism) retained locally</th>
<th>Entry fees, conservancy fees, conservation fees, leases, licenses, bednights, revenue-share receipts, education / bursary payout schemes - should be available from Calvin. Audited accounts of MMGR (19% due to wards surrounding MMGR, goes into administrative black hole)</th>
<th>Entry fees, conservancy fees, conservation fees, leases, licenses, bednights, revenue-share receipts, education / bursary payout schemes - all held with BLF. Revenue from Amboseli NP (center zone - Ol Tukai area) goes to the Kajiado County Council (not clear what flows to Conservancies - nothing?). KWS bursaries distributed to key conservancies including Satao</th>
<th>Entry fees, conservancy fees, conservation fees, leases, licenses, bednights, revenue-share receipts, education / bursary payout schemes - all held with SORALO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>% of value of wildlife economy (NGO) retained locally</td>
<td>not known</td>
<td>Donor grants - value of projects at community level</td>
<td>Donor grants - value of projects at community level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible benefits</td>
<td>Five point scale</td>
<td>Not tracked to date - could see if any of the 'education' NGOs have been tracking</td>
<td>Not tracked to date - could see if any of the 'education' NGOs have been tracking</td>
<td>Might be in the PRAs - to be checked - could see if any of the 'education' NGOs have been tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible benefits</td>
<td>Five point scale</td>
<td>Numbers of people employed as rangers, hotel staff, drivers, guides. Clinics, schools, school inputs, cultural centres - both buildings and employment. Conservation clubs and trips to the game area. People employed as community liaison officers. Beadwork (mostly women)</td>
<td>Numbers of people employed as rangers, hotel staff, drivers, guides. Clinics, schools, cultural centres - both buildings and employment. People employed as community liaison officers. Beadwork (mostly women). Grass cutter machine - to sell grass to community. (Need to find out if this conservancy is a registered group for using the slaughterhouse)</td>
<td>Numbers of people employed as rangers, hotel staff, drivers, guides. Clinics, schools, cultural centres - both buildings and employment. People employed as community liaison officers. Beadwork (mostly women). Conservation clubs - not sure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community organization</strong></td>
<td>Number of registered/operating Community Based Organizations managing environment and/or wildlife economy</td>
<td>Conservancy Trust (Trust Deed), distribution of benefits is decided by the Committee and the Trust implements those distribution. Cottars Camp is the LLC in place to limit liability.</td>
<td>Conservancy Trust (Trust Deed), benefits are then distributed through CBOs. (not sure if there is an LLC doing the Management work)</td>
<td>Conservancy Trust (Trust Deed), benefits distributed through CBOs. Trust hires an LLC to undertake conservation and business activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community capacity to act for conservation</strong></td>
<td>Five point scale</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>A lot of emphasis on this at SORALO - records of training, etc. Numbers of local community members involved in management positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development of wildlife and alternative economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private parks/wildlife-based business</td>
<td>Number of enterprises</td>
<td>Yes - available</td>
<td>Yes - available - business registers, tour companies, etc</td>
<td>Yes - available - business registers, tour companies, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community small enterprises directly related to parks and wildlife</td>
<td>Number of enterprises</td>
<td>Beadwork, meat production, veggies, cultural boma visits - information available but not compiled</td>
<td>Beadwork, meat production, veggies, cultural boma visits - information available but not compiled</td>
<td>Beadwork, meat production, veggies, cultural boma visits - information available but not compiled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New non-wildlife related businesses directly related to the project</td>
<td>Number of enterprises</td>
<td>Information available but not compiled</td>
<td>Information available but not compiled</td>
<td>Information available but not compiled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INPUT INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law enforcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patrol staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patrol days / investigation days</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals killed (target species, other species)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrests</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is there a system for tracking investigations Y/N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patrol registers, incident/occurrence books, sit reps, recoveries. Scope is beyond the Conservancy boundary. Held at Conservancy in MIST. Compiled into monthly reports.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patrol registers, observation books, sit reps, recoveries. Held at Conservancy, communicated to BLF - who compiles in SMART. Compiled into monthly reports.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLF keeps records from investigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rely on KWS for tracking these.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rely on KWS for tracking these.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KWS has all this information (held in the</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>